arXiv:1610.04994v1 [math.NA] 17 Oct 2016

,

ANALYSIS OF DISCONTINUOUS GALERKIN METHODS USING MESH-DEPENDENT NORMS

EMMANUIL H. GEORGOULIS AND TRISTAN PRYER

Abstract. We prove the inf-sup stability of a discontinuous Galerkin scheme for second order elliptic operators in (unbalanced) mesh-dependent norms for quasi-uniform meshes for all spatial dimensions. This results in a priori error bounds in these norms.

1. Introduction

Discontinuous Galerkin (dG) methods are a popular family of non-conforming finite element-type approximation schemes for partial differential equations (PDEs) involving discontinuous approximation spaces. In the context of elliptic problems their inception can be traced back to the 1970s [17, 4]; see also [1] for an accessible overview and history of these methods for second order problems. For higher order problems, for example the (nonlinear) biharmonic problem, dG methods are a useful alternative to using C^1-conforming elements whose derivation and implementation can become very complicated [4, 11, 18].

Inf-sup conditions form one part of the Banach–Nečas–Babuška condition which guarantees the well-posedness of a given variational problem. In this note, we shall describe an analytical framework to examine the stability of dG approximations for L_2- H^2-like mesh-dependent norms. This is in keeping with the spirit of [2, 3], where for continuous finite element methods the authors prove equivalent results for second and fourth order problems respectively. The present approach, however, is quite different and results to inf-sup stability for H^2-like mesh-dependent norms under the assumption that the underlying mesh is quasi-uniform.

The analysis presented utilises a new H^2-*conforming reconstruction operator*, based on Hsieh–Clough–Tocher-type C^1 reconstructions. Such reconstructions, based on nodal averaging, are used for the proof of a posteriori bounds for non-conforming methods for elliptic [15, 6, 11, 19] and hyperbolic problems [10, 13]. The use of these operators is not limited to an a posteriori setting, indeed, they have been used to show a priori bounds for dG methods for elliptic problems, in [14] under minimal regularity.

The new reconstruction operators presented below enjoys certain orthogonality properties; in particular, they are *adjoint orthogonal* to the underlying Hsieh–Clough–Tocher space and maintain the same stability bounds as the H^2-conforming reconstruction from [11]. This, in addition, allows us to show optimal convergence in a mesh dependent H^2-like norm.

The argument is quite general and allows the derivation of inf-sup stability results whenever the numerical scheme has a well posed discrete adjoint (dual) problem over an appropriately constructed non-conforming finite element space. This is contrary to the Aubin–Nitsche L_2 duality argument whereby it is the underlying partial differential operator itself that requires the well posedness of the adjoint *continuous* problem.

2. Problem set up and discretisation

To highlight the main steps of the present developments in this area, we consider the Poisson problem with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex domain and consider the problem: find $u \in \mathrm{H}^2(\Omega) \cap \mathrm{H}^1_0(\Omega)$, such that

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega f\ v \,\mathrm{d}x \quad \forall\, v \in \mathrm{H}^1_0(\Omega). \tag{1}$$

We consider $\mathscr{T}$ to be a conforming triangulation of Ω, namely, $\mathscr{T}$ is a finite family of sets such that

(1) $K \in \mathscr{T}$ implies K is an open simplex (segment for $d = 1$, triangle for $d = 2$, tetrahedron for $d = 3$),
(2) for any $K, J \in \mathscr{T}$ we have that $\overline{K} \cap \overline{J}$ is a full lower-dimensional simplex (i.e., it is either $\emptyset$, a vertex, an edge, a face, or the whole of $\overline{K}$ and $\overline{J}$) of both $\overline{K}$ and $\overline{J}$ and
(3) $\bigcup_{K\in\mathscr{T}} \overline{K} = \overline{\Omega}$.

The shape regularity constant of $\mathscr{T}$ is defined as the number

$$\mu(\mathscr{T}) := \inf_{K\in\mathscr{T}} \frac{\rho_K}{h_K}, \tag{2}$$

where ρ_K is the radius of the largest ball contained inside K and h_K is the diameter of K. An indexed family of triangulations $\{\mathscr{T}^n\}_n$ is called *shape regular* if

$$\mu := \inf_n \mu(\mathscr{T}^n) > 0. \tag{3}$$

Further, we define $h : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ to be the piecewise constant *meshsize function* of $\mathscr{T}$ given by

$$h(\mathbf{x}) := \max_{\overline{K}\ni\mathbf{x}} h_K.$$

A mesh is called quasiuniform when there exists a positive constant C such that $\max_{x\in\Omega} h \leq C \min_{x\in\Omega} h$. In what follows we shall assume that all triangulations are shape-regular and quasiuniform.

We let $\mathscr{E}$ be the skeleton (set of common interfaces) of the triangulation $\mathscr{T}$ and say $e \in \mathscr{E}$ if e is on the interior of Ω and $e \in \partial\Omega$ if e lies on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ and set h_e to be the diameter of e. We also define the "broken" gradient ∇_h, Laplacian Δ_h and Hessian D_h^2 to be defined element-wise by $\nabla_h w|_K = \nabla w$, $\Delta_h w|_K = \Delta w$, $\mathrm{D}_h^2 w|_K = \mathrm{D}^2 w$ for all $K \in \mathscr{T}$, respectively, for respectively smooth functions on the interior of K,

We let $\mathbb{P}^k(\mathscr{T})$ denote the space of piecewise polynomials of degree k over the triangulation $\mathscr{T}$, and introduce the *finite element space* $\mathbb{V} := \mathbb{P}^k(\mathscr{T})$ to be the usual space of discontinuous piecewise polynomial functions of degree k. We define average operators for arbitrary scalar functions v and vectors $\mathbf{v}$ over an edge e shared by elements K_1 and K_2 as $\{\!\{ v \}\!\}= \frac{1}{2}(v|_{K_1} + v|_{K_2})$, $\{\!\{ \mathbf{v} \}\!\}= \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{v}|_{K_1} + \mathbf{v}|_{K_2})$ and jump operators as $[\![v]\!] = v|_{K_1}\boldsymbol{n}_{K_1} + v|_{K_2}\boldsymbol{n}_{K_2}$, $[\![\mathbf{v}]\!] = \mathbf{v}|_{K_1}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}_{K_1} + \mathbf{v}|_{K_2}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}_{K_2}$. Note that on the boundary of the domain $\partial\Omega$ the jump and average operators are defined as $\{\!\{ v \}\!\}\Big|_{\partial\Omega} := v$, $\{\!\{ \boldsymbol{v} \}\!\}\Big|_{\partial\Omega} := \boldsymbol{v}$, $[\![v]\!]\Big|_{\partial\Omega} := v\boldsymbol{n}$, $[\![\boldsymbol{v}]\!]\Big|_{\partial\Omega} := \boldsymbol{v}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}$,

Definition 2.1 (mesh dependent norms)**.** *We introduce the mesh dependent* H^1*-and* H^2*-norms to be*

$$\|w_h\|_{dG}^2 := \|\nabla_h w_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)}^2 + \|h^{-1/2}\,[\![u_h]\!]\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E}\cup\partial\Omega)}^2 \tag{4}$$

$$|\!|\!| w_h |\!|\!|_{dG}^2 := \|\Delta_h w_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)}^2 + \|h^{-1/2}\,[\![\nabla w_h]\!]\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})}^2 + \|h^{-3/2}\,[\![w_h]\!]\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E}\cup\partial\Omega)}^2. \tag{5}$$

Consider the interior penalty (IP) discretisation of (1), to find $u_h \in \mathbb{V}$ such that

$$\mathscr{A}_h(u_h, v_h) = \langle f, v_h\rangle \quad \forall\, v_h \in \mathbb{V}, \tag{6}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{A}_h(u_h, v_h) = &\int_\Omega \nabla_h u_h\cdot\nabla_h v_h \,\mathrm{d}x - \int_{\mathscr{E}\cup\partial\Omega} [\![u_h]\!]\cdot\{\!\{\nabla v_h\}\!\} + [\![v_h]\!]\cdot\{\!\{\nabla u_h\}\!\}\,\mathrm{d}s\\ &+ \int_{\mathscr{E}\cup\partial\Omega}\frac{\sigma_0}{h}[\![u_h]\!]\cdot[\![v_h]\!]\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_{\mathscr{E}}\sigma_1 h\,[\![\nabla u_h]\!]\cdot[\![\nabla v_h]\!]\,\mathrm{d}s,\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\sigma_0, \sigma_1 > 0$ represent *penalty parameters*. Note that a standard choice is to take $\sigma_1 = 0$. The choice $\sigma_1 \neq 0$ results in a class of *stabilised* dG methods [7].

Proposition 2.2 (continuity and coercivity of $\mathscr{A}_h(\cdot,\cdot)$ [1, 9, c.f.])**.** *For* $\sigma_1 \geq 0$ *and* σ_0 *large enough, the bilinear form* $\mathscr{A}_h(\cdot,\cdot)$ *satisfies*

$$\mathscr{A}_h(u_h, u_h) \geq C\|u_h\|_{dG} \tag{8}$$

$$\mathscr{A}_h(u_h, v_h) \leq C\|u_h\|_{dG}\|v_h\|_{dG}. \tag{9}$$

Lax-Milgram Theorem guarantees a unique solution to the problem (7). Also, since $u \in \mathrm{H}^2(\Omega)$*, the bilinear form is* consistent*, hence, Strang's Lemma yields quasioptimal convergence of the method in the* $\|\cdot\|_{dG}$ *norm:*

$$\|u - u_h\|_{dG} \leq C \inf_{w_h\in\mathbb{V}} \|u - w_h\|_{dG}. \tag{10}$$

Conforming reconstruction operators: The key tool in the proof of the inf-sup condition is the notion of *reconstruction operators*. It is commonplace in the a posteriori analysis of nonconforming schemes to make use of such operators. A simple, quite general methodology for the construction of reconstruction operators is to use an averaging interpolation operator into an H^2-conforming finite element space. For example a C^1 Hsieh–Clough–Tocher (HCT) macro-element conforming space for H^2 conformity [5, 11, c.f.]. Another option is the use of Argyris-type reconstructions [5].

Example 2.3 ($\mathrm{H}^2(\Omega)$-reconstructions)**.** *An example of* $\mathrm{H}^2(\Omega)$ *reconstruction operator* $E^2(u_h)$ *of quadratic Lagrange elements* ($k=2$) *is defined as follows. Let* $\mathbf{x}$ *be a degree of freedom of the* H^2*-conforming space* $HCT(k+2)$ *consisting of HCT-type macro-elements of degree* $k+2$*, and let* $\widehat{K_{\mathbf{x}}}$ *be the set of all elements sharing the degree of freedom* $\mathbf{x}$*. Then, the reconstruction at that specific degree of freedom is given by*

$$E^2(u_h)(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\operatorname{card}(\widehat{K_{\mathbf{x}}})} \sum_{K\in\widehat{K_{\mathbf{x}}}} u_h|_K(\mathbf{x}). \tag{11}$$

For the case $k=2$*, the associated degrees of freedom are illustrated in Figure 1. Notice that the degrees of freedom of the reconstruction are a superset of those of the original finite element. This is due to the lack of existence of a conforming* $\mathrm{H}^2(\Omega)$ *subspace in* $\mathbb{V}$ *for low* k*; for instance, the existence of an* $\mathrm{H}^2(\Omega)$*-conforming space requires* $k\geq 5$ *in two dimensions (Argyris space). Corresponding reconstructions for higher polynomial degrees have been considered in* [5, 11]*, for instance.*



FIGURE 1. The $\mathbb{P}^4$ Hsieh–Clough–Tocher-type macro-element, as a $\mathrm{H}^2(\Omega)$-conforming reconstruction to the quadratic Lagrange element.

Lemma 2.4 (reconstruction bounds [11, Lem 3.1])**.** *The* $HCT(k+2)$ *reconstruction operator* $E^2:\mathbb{V}\to\mathrm{H}^2(\Omega)$ *satisifies the following bound for all* $u_h\in\mathbb{V}$*:*

$$\|E^2(u_h)-u_h\|_{dG}^2 \leq C\Big(\|h^{1/2}\,[\![\nabla u_h]\!]\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})}^2 + \|h^{-1/2}\,[\![u_h]\!]\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})}^2\Big), \tag{12}$$

with the constant $C>0$ *independent of* u_h *and of* h*.*

Using this $\mathrm{HCT}(k+2)$-reconstruction, we can construct a further $\mathrm{HCT}(k+2)$-reconstruction admitting the same bounds, but also satisfying an *adjoint orthogonality* property.

Definition 2.5 ($HCT(k+2)$-Ritz reconstruction)**.** *We define the Hsieh–Clough–Tocher* $\mathrm{H}^2(\Omega)$*-conforming Ritz reconstruction operator* $E^{\mathscr{R}}:\mathbb{V}\to HCT(k+2)$ *such that*

$$\int_\Omega \nabla E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h)\cdot\nabla\widetilde{v}\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega \nabla_h u_h\cdot\nabla\widetilde{v}\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_{\mathscr{E}\cup\partial\Omega}[\![u_h]\!]\cdot\nabla\widetilde{v}\,\mathrm{d}s \quad \forall\,\widetilde{v}\in HCT(k+2). \tag{13}$$

Lemma 2.6 (Properties of $E^{\mathscr{R}}$)**.** *The* $HCT(k+2)$*-Ritz reconstruction is well-defined and satisfies the orthogonality condition:*

$$\int_\Omega \big(u_h - E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h)\big)\,\Delta\widetilde{v} = 0 \quad \forall\,\widetilde{v}\in HCT(k+2). \tag{14}$$

In addition, for $\alpha=0,1,2$*, we have*

$$\sum_{K\in\mathscr{T}} \Big|E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h)-u_h\Big|_{\mathrm{H}^\alpha(K)}^2 \leq C\Big(\|h^{3/2-\alpha}\,[\![\nabla u_h]\!]\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})}^2 + \|h^{1/2-\alpha}\,[\![u_h]\!]\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})}^2\Big), \tag{15}$$

for $C>0$ *constants, independent of* u_h *and of* h*.*

Proof Fixing $u_h \in \mathbb{V}$, $E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h)$ is well-defined. Indeed, setting $\widetilde{v} = E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h)$ in (13), along with a standard inverse estimate, we deduce

$$\|\nabla E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h)\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \leq C\|\nabla u_h\|_{dG},$$

for $C > 0$ independent of u_h. The orthogonality condition follows from integrating both sides of (13) by parts.

To see (15) we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h) - u_h\|_{dG}^2 &\leq C\mathscr{A}_h\big(E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h) - u_h, E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h) - u_h\big) \\ &= C\mathscr{A}_h\big(E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h) - u_h, E^{2}(u_h) - u_h\big) \\ &\leq C\|E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h) - u_h\|_{dG}\|E^{2}(u_h) - u_h\|_{dG}. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Using the properties of $E^2(u_h)$ from Lemma 2.4 shows the claim for $\alpha = 1$. The result for $\alpha = 2$ follows by an inverse inequality.

For $\alpha = 0$ we use a duality argument. Take $z \in \mathrm{H}^2(\Omega) \cap \mathrm{H}_0^1(\Omega)$ as the solution of the dual problem

$$-\Delta z = E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h) - u_h \tag{17}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \|E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h) - u_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)}^2 &= \int_\Omega -\Delta z\big(E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h) - u_h\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \int_\Omega -(\Delta z - \Delta\widetilde{z})\big(E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h) - u_h\big)\,\mathrm{d}s \quad \forall\, \widetilde{z} \in \mathrm{HCT}(k+2), \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

in view of the orthogonality property (14). Integrating by parts we see

$$\begin{aligned} \|E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h) - u_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)}^2 &= \int_\Omega (\nabla z - \nabla\widetilde{z})\cdot\big(\nabla E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h) - \nabla_h u_h\big)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\mathscr{E}} \{\!\{\, \nabla z - \nabla\widetilde{z}\,\}\!\}\cdot[\![u_h]\!]\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &\leq \|h^{-1}(\nabla z - \nabla\widetilde{z})\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)}\|h(\nabla E^{\mathscr{R}}(u_h) - \nabla_h u_h)\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \\ &\quad + \|h^{-1/2}\{\!\{\, \nabla z - \nabla\widetilde{z}\,\}\!\}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})}\|h^{1/2}[\![u_h]\!]\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

The result follows using the approximability of the $\mathrm{HCT}(k+2)$ space [8] and the regularity of the dual problem. □

Theorem 2.7 (inf–sup stability)**.** *For polynomial degree $k \geq 2$ there exists a $\gamma > 0$, independent of h, such that*

$$\sup_{v_h \in \mathbb{V}} \frac{\mathscr{A}_h(w_h, v_h)}{|\!|\!| v_h |\!|\!|_{dG}} \geq \gamma_h \|w_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \tag{20}$$

and

$$\sup_{\widetilde{v} \in W(h)} \frac{\mathscr{A}_h(w_h, \widetilde{v})}{\|\widetilde{v}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)}} \geq \gamma_h\, |\!|\!| w_h |\!|\!|_{dG}, \tag{21}$$

where $W(h) := \mathbb{V} + HCT(k+2)$.

Proof The proof of both inf-sup conditions consists of two steps. For example in (21) we first show there exists a $\widetilde{v} \in W(h)$ such that

$$\mathscr{A}_h(w_h, \widetilde{v}) \geq C(\min_{x\in\Omega} h)^2\, |\!|\!| w_h |\!|\!|_{dG}^2 \tag{22}$$

and then show that

$$\|\widetilde{v}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \leq C(\max_{x\in\Omega} h)^2\, |\!|\!| w_h |\!|\!|_{dG}, \tag{23}$$

along with the quasi-uniformity assumption on the mesh.

Firstly note that, after an integration by parts, the IP method (7) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{A}_h(w_h, v_h) = \int_\Omega -\Delta_h w_h v_h\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\mathscr{E}} [\![\nabla w_h]\!]\,\{\!\{\, v_h\,\}\!\}\,\mathrm{d}s - \int_{\mathscr{E}\cup\partial\Omega} [\![w_h]\!]\,\{\!\{\, \nabla v_h\,\}\!\}\,\mathrm{d}s \\ + \int_{\mathscr{E}\cup\partial\Omega} \frac{\sigma_0}{h}\,[\![w_h]\!]\cdot[\![v_h]\!]\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_{\mathscr{E}} \sigma_1 h\,[\![\nabla w_h]\!]\cdot[\![\nabla v_h]\!]\,\mathrm{d}s. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Upon setting $\widetilde{v} = w_h - E^{\mathscr{R}}(w_h) - \alpha h^2 \Delta_h w_h$, for some parameter $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ to be chosen below, we compute

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{A}_h(w_h, \widetilde{v}) &= \alpha \|h \Delta_h w_h\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} + \sigma_1 \|h^{1/2} \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} + \sigma_0 \|h^{-1/2} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E} \cup \partial\Omega)} \\
&\quad - \int_\Omega \Delta_h w_h \big(w_h - E^{\mathscr{R}}(w_h)\big) \,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathscr{E}} \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket \{\!\{ w_h - E^{\mathscr{R}}(w_h) \}\!\} \,\mathrm{d}s - \int_{\mathscr{E} \cup \partial\Omega} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket \cdot \{\!\{ \nabla \big(w_h - E^{\mathscr{R}}(w_h)\big) \}\!\} \,\mathrm{d}s \\
&\quad - \alpha \int_{\mathscr{E}} h^2 \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket \{\!\{ \Delta w_h \}\!\} \,\mathrm{d}s + \alpha \int_{\mathscr{E} \cup \partial\Omega} h^2 \llbracket w_h \rrbracket \cdot \{\!\{ \nabla \Delta w_h \}\!\} \,\mathrm{d}s \\
&\quad - \alpha\sigma_1 \int_{\mathscr{E}} h^3 \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket \llbracket \nabla \Delta w_h \rrbracket \,\mathrm{d}s - \sigma_0 \alpha \int_{\mathscr{E} \cup \partial\Omega} h \llbracket w_h \rrbracket \cdot \llbracket \Delta w_h \rrbracket \,\mathrm{d}s.
\end{aligned} \tag{25}
$$

The orthogonality property of the HCT$(k+2)$-Ritz reconstruction (13) yields

$$
\int_\Omega -\Delta_h w_h \big(w_h - E^{\mathscr{R}}(w_h)\big) \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega \big(\Delta E^{\mathscr{R}}(w_h) - \Delta_h w_h\big)\big(w_h - E^{\mathscr{R}}(w_h)\big) \,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{26}
$$

Repeated use of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, therefore, gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{A}_h(w_h, \widetilde{v}) &\geq \alpha \|h \Delta_h w_h\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} + \sigma_1 \|h^{1/2} \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} + \sigma_0 \|h^{-1/2} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E} \cup \partial\Omega)} \\
&\quad - \|h\big(\Delta_h w_h - \Delta E^{\mathscr{R}}(w_h)\big)\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \|h^{-1}\big(w_h - E^{\mathscr{R}}(w_h)\big)\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad - \|h^{1/2} \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} \|h^{-1/2} \{\!\{ w_h - E^{\mathscr{R}}(w_h) \}\!\}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} \\
&\quad - \|h^{-1/2} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E} \cup \partial\Omega)} \|h^{1/2} \{\!\{ \nabla w_h - \nabla E^{\mathscr{R}}(w_h) \}\!\}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E} \cup \partial\Omega)} \\
&\quad - \alpha \|h^{1/2} \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} \|h^{3/2} \{\!\{ \Delta w_h \}\!\}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} \\
&\quad - \alpha \|h^{-1/2} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E} \cup \partial\Omega)} \|h^{5/2} \{\!\{ \nabla \Delta w_h \}\!\}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E} \cup \partial\Omega)} \\
&\quad - \sigma_1 \alpha \|h^{1/2} \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} \|h^{5/2} \llbracket \nabla \Delta w_h \rrbracket\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} \\
&\quad - \sigma_0 \alpha \|h^{-1/2} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E} \cup \partial\Omega)} \|h^{3/2} \llbracket \Delta w_h \rrbracket\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E} \cup \partial\Omega)} \\
&=: \alpha \|h \Delta_h w_h\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} + \sigma_1 \|h^{1/2} \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} + \sigma_0 \|h^{-1/2} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E} \cup \partial\Omega)} - \sum_{i=1}^{7} \mathscr{I}_i.
\end{aligned} \tag{27}
$$

We proceed to bound each of the terms $\mathscr{I}_i$ individually. Note that in view of scaling and inverse inequalities we have for any $w_h \in \mathbb{V}$:

$$
\|\{\!\{ w_h \}\!\}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(e)} \leq C_1 \|h^{-1/2} w_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\bar{K}_1 \cup \bar{K}_2)} \tag{28}
$$

$$
\|\{\!\{ \nabla w_h \}\!\}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(e)} \leq C_2 \|h^{-3/2} w_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\bar{K}_1 \cup \bar{K}_2)} \tag{29}
$$

for any edge/face $e := \bar{K}_1 \cap \bar{K}_2 \in \mathscr{E}$, and elements $K_1, K_2 \in \mathscr{T}$, with C_1, C_2 depending only on the mesh-regularity and shape-regularity constants.

For $\mathscr{I}_1$, in view of Lemma 2.6, we have

$$
\mathscr{I}_1 \leq C_3 \Big(\|h^{1/2} \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} + \|h^{-1/2} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} \Big), \tag{30}
$$

with constant $C_3 > 0$ being the maximum of all constants in (15) for all α.

For $\mathscr{I}_2$, (28) and Lemma 2.6 yield

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{I}_2 &\leq C_1 C_3^{1/2} \|h^{1/2} \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} \Big(\|h^{1/2} \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} + \|h^{-1/2} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} \Big)^{1/2} \\
&\leq C_1^2 C_3 \|h^{1/2} \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} + \frac{C_1^2 C_3}{2} \|h^{-1/2} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})}.
\end{aligned} \tag{31}
$$

For $\mathscr{I}_3$, (29) and Lemma 2.6 yield

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{I}_3 &\leq C_2 C_3^{1/2} \|h^{-1/2} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E} \cup \partial\Omega)} \Big(\|h^{1/2} \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} + \|h^{-1/2} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})} \Big)^{1/2} \\
&\leq C_2^2 C_3 \|h^{1/2} \llbracket \nabla w_h \rrbracket\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E} \cup \partial\Omega)} + \frac{C_2^2 C_3}{2} \|h^{-1/2} \llbracket w_h \rrbracket\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})}.
\end{aligned} \tag{32}
$$

For $\mathscr{I}_4$, we have

$$\mathscr{I}_4 \leq C_1\alpha\|h^{1/2}\,[\![\nabla w_h]\!]\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})}\|h\Delta w_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon_4\alpha\|h\Delta w_h\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} + \frac{C_1^2\alpha}{4\epsilon_4}\|h^{1/2}\,[\![\nabla w_h]\!]\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})}, \tag{33}$$

for any $\epsilon_4 > 0$, while for $\mathscr{I}_5$, we get

$$\mathscr{I}_5 \leq C_2\alpha\|h^{-1/2}\,[\![w_h]\!]\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E}\cup\partial\Omega)}\|h\Delta w_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon_5\alpha\|h\Delta w_h\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} + \frac{C_2^2\alpha}{4\epsilon_5}\|h^{-1/2}\,[\![w_h]\!]\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E}\cup\partial\Omega)}. \tag{34}$$

for any $\epsilon_5 > 0$; similarly for $\mathscr{I}_6$ and for any $\epsilon_6 > 0$, we have

$$\mathscr{I}_6 \leq C_2\sigma_1\alpha\|h^{1/2}\,[\![\nabla w_h]\!]\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})}\|h\Delta w_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon_6\alpha\|h\Delta w_h\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} + \frac{C_2^2\sigma_1^2\alpha}{4\epsilon_6}\|h^{1/2}\,[\![\nabla w_h]\!]\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})}. \tag{35}$$

Finally, the last term $\mathscr{I}_7$ can be bounded as follows:

$$\mathscr{I}_7 \leq C_1\sigma_0\alpha\|h^{-1/2}\,[\![w_h]\!]\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E}\cup\partial\Omega)}\|h\Delta_h w_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \leq \epsilon_7\alpha\|h\Delta_h w_h\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} + \frac{C_1^2\sigma_0^2\alpha}{4\epsilon_7}\|h^{-1/2}\,[\![w_h]\!]\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E}\cup\partial\Omega)}, \tag{36}$$

for any $\epsilon_7 > 0$.

Collecting the results (30)–(36) and substituting this into (27) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{A}_h(w_h,\widetilde{v}) \geq\ & \|h\Delta_h w_h\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)}\alpha\Big(1-\epsilon_4-\epsilon_5-\epsilon_6-\epsilon_7\Big)\\ &+\|h^{1/2}\,[\![\nabla w_h]\!]\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E})}\Big(\sigma_1 - C_3 - C_1^2C_3 - \frac{C_2^2C_3^2}{2} - \frac{C_1^2\alpha}{4\epsilon_4} - \frac{C_2^2\sigma_1^2\alpha}{4\epsilon_6}\Big)\\ &+\|h^{-1/2}\,[\![w_h]\!]\|^2_{\mathrm{L}_2(\mathscr{E}\cup\Omega)}\Big(\sigma_0 - C_3 - \frac{C_1^2C_3}{2} - C_2^2C_3 - \frac{C_2^2\alpha}{4\epsilon_5} - \frac{C_1^2\sigma_0^2\alpha}{4\epsilon_7}\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

To arrive to (22), we can choose $\epsilon_4 = \epsilon_5 = \epsilon_6 = \epsilon_7 = \frac{1}{5}$, $\alpha = (\max(\sigma_0^2,\sigma_1^2))^{-1}$ and σ_0 and σ_1 large enough.

For (23), we use Lemma 2.6 to see that

$$\|\widetilde{v}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \leq \|w_h - E^{\mathscr{R}}(w_h)\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} + \|\alpha h^2\Delta_h w_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \leq C\,|\!|\!|h^2 w_h|\!|\!|_{dG}, \tag{38}$$

yielding (21).

To show (20) we fix w_h and let $\Phi \in \mathbb{V}$ be the solution of the dual problem

$$\mathscr{A}_h(\Psi,\Phi) = \int_\Omega w_h\Psi \quad \forall\,\Psi\in\mathbb{V}. \tag{39}$$

Following the same arguments as above, it is clear that there exists a $C > 0$ such that

$$C\,|\!|\!|\Phi|\!|\!|^2_{dG} \leq \mathscr{A}_h(\Phi,\widetilde{v})\,, \tag{40}$$

where $\widetilde{v} := \Phi - E^{\mathscr{R}}(\Phi) - \alpha h^2\Delta_h\Phi$. Now in view of [12, Lem 4.2] we have, with R denoting the $\mathscr{A}_h$ orthogonal projector into $\mathbb{V}$, that

$$\|R\widetilde{v}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \leq C\big(\|h\nabla\widetilde{v}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} + \|\widetilde{v}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)}\big) \leq C\|\widetilde{v}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)}, \tag{41}$$

through inverse inequalities. Hence arguing as above

$$\|R\widetilde{v}\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)}\,|\!|\!|\Phi|\!|\!|_{dG} \leq\ |\!|\!|\Phi|\!|\!|^2_{dG} \leq \mathscr{A}_h(\Phi,\widetilde{v}) = \mathscr{A}_h(\Phi,R\widetilde{v})\,, \tag{42}$$

concluding the proof. □

Corollary 2.8 (Convergence)**.** *Let $u \in \mathrm{H}^{k+1}(\Omega)$ and $u_h \in \mathbb{V}$ be the interior penalty approximation from (7), then*

$$\|u-u_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} \leq \Big(1 + \frac{C_B(1+C_S)}{\gamma}\Big)\inf_{w_h\in\mathbb{V}}\|u-w_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} + \sup_{v_h\in\mathbb{V}}\frac{\mathscr{A}_h(u_h-u,v_h)}{|\!|\!|v_h|\!|\!|_{dG}}. \tag{43}$$

We can infer from this the a priori bound that,

$$\|u-u_h\|_{\mathrm{L}_2(\Omega)} + \|h(u-u_h)\|_{dG} + |\!|\!|h^2(u-u_h)|\!|\!|_{dG} \leq Ch^{k+1}\,|u|_{k+1}\,. \tag{44}$$

1. D. N. Arnold, F. Brezzi, B. Cockburn, and L. D. Marini. Unified analysis of discontinuous Galerkin methods for elliptic problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 39(5):1749–1779, 2001/02.
2. I. Babuška and J. Osborn. Analysis of finite element methods for second order boundary value problems using mesh dependent norms. *Numer. Math.*, 34(1):41–62, 1980.

3. I. Babuška, J. Osborn, and J. Pitkäranta. Analysis of mixed methods using mesh dependent norms. *Math. Comp.*, 35(152):1039–1062, 1980.
4. G. A. Baker. Finite element methods for elliptic equations using nonconforming elements. *Math. Comp.*, 31(137):45–59, 1977.
5. S. C. Brenner, T. Gudi, and L.-Y. Sung. A weakly over-penalized symmetric interior penalty method for the biharmonic problem. *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, 37:214–238, 2010.
6. S. C. Brenner, T. Gudi, and L.-Y. Sung. An a posteriori error estimator for a quadratic C^0-interior penalty method for the biharmonic problem. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* , 30(3):777–798, 2010.
7. E. Burman. A unified analysis for conforming and nonconforming stabilized finite element methods using interior penalty. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 43(5):2012–2033 (electronic), 2005.
8. P. G. Ciarlet. *The finite element method for elliptic problems*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1978. Studies in Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. 4.
9. A. Ern and J.-L. Guermond. *Theory and practice of finite elements*, volume 159 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.
10. E. H. Georgoulis, E. Hall, and C. Makridakis. A posteriori error control for discontinuous galerkin methods for first order hyperbolic problems. *Recent Developments in Discontinuous Galerkin Finite Element Methods for Partial Differential Equations: 2012 John H Barrett Memorial Lectures*, 2014.
11. E. H. Georgoulis, P. Houston, and J. Virtanen. An *a posteriori* error indicator for discontinuous Galerkin approximations of fourth-order elliptic problems. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 31(1):281–298, 2011.
12. E. H. Georgoulis, C. G. Makridakis, and T. Pryer. Babuška-Osborn techniques in discontinuous Galerkin methods: L^2 error estimates for unstructured meshes. *Preprint*, 2016.
13. J. Giesselmann, C. Makridakis, and T. Pryer. A Posteriori Analysis of Discontinuous Galerkin Schemes for Systems of Hyperbolic Conservation Laws. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 53(3):1280–1303, 2015.
14. T. Gudi. A new error analysis for discontinuous finite element methods for linear elliptic problems. *Math. Comp.*, 79(272):2169–2189, 2010.
15. O. A. Karakashian and F. Pascal. A posteriori error estimates for a discontinuous Galerkin approximation of second-order elliptic problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 41(6):2374–2399 (electronic), 2003.
16. C. G. Makridakis. On the Babuška-Osborn approach to finite element analysis: L^2 estimates for unstructured meshes. *Preprint*, 2016.
17. J. Nitsche. Über ein Variationsprinzip zur Lösung von Dirichlet-Problemen bei Verwendung von Teilräumen, die keinen Randbedingungen unterworfen sind. *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg*, 36:9–15, 1971. Collection of articles dedicated to Lothar Collatz on his sixtieth birthday.
18. T. Pryer. Discontinuous Galerkin methods for the p-biharmonic equation from a discrete variational perspective. *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, 41:328–349, 2014.
19. T. Pryer. An a posteriori analysis of some inconsistent, nonconforming Galerkin methods approximating elliptic problems. *Submitted - tech report available on ArXiV http://arxiv.org/abs/1505.04318*, 2015.

(EG) Department of Mathematics, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH, UK and Department of Mathematics, School of Applied Mathematical and Physical Sciences, National Technical University of Athens, Zografou 157 80, Greece. Emmanuil.Georgoulis@le.ac.uk

(TP) Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Reading, Whiteknights, PO Box 220, Reading RG6 6AX, UK. t.pryer@reading.ac.uk